



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,220	12/07/2004	Luppo Edens	GRT/4662-356	2616
23117	7590	03/31/2009	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			HUTSON, RICHARD G	
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			1652	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/31/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/517,220	Applicant(s) EDENS ET AL.
	Examiner Richard G. Hutson	Art Unit 1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 17-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23,24,27,29-33,38,41,44 and 47 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 17-22,25,26,28,34-37,39,40,42,43,45,46 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment of claim 19, in the paper of 3/25/2009, is acknowledged. Claims 17-47 are pending and at issue. The office appreciates applicants comments and attention to detail regarding the previous restriction requirement made on 12/23/2009. Accordingly applicant the revised restriction requirement as discussed in the interview of 2/4/2009 is noted below.

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Species Group 1:

Those auxiliary enzymes selected from :

- 1) an exoprotease and
- 2) an endoprotease;

Species Group 2:

Those exoproteases selected from:

- 1') tripeptidylpeptidase,
- 2') carboxypeptidase and
- 3') peptidyl-dipeptidase;

Species Group 3:

Those endoproteases selected from:

- A) glycine-specific endoprotease and
- B) aspartic acid protease;

Species Group 4:

A') a method to prevent or reduce haze in a beverage, wherein said beverage is beer.

B') a method to prevent or reduce haze in a beverage, wherein said beverage is wine.

C') a method to prevent or reduce haze in a beverage, wherein said beverage is fruit juice.

Applicant was required, to elect a **single species from each of Group 1, 2, 3 and 4** above, to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic: 17, 18, 23-26, 39-47

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species corresponding to each of the different auxiliary enzymes and the different methods of preventing or reducing haze in a beverage selected from compositions of beer, wine and fruit juice do not share a special technical feature. It continues that US2004/0241791 teach methods comprising adding a proline-specific endoprotease to a beverage and thus, the shared technical feature of the groups is not a "special technical feature", unity of invention between the groups does not exist.

Election

Applicant's previous election with traverse of Group III, claims 17-24, 28-30 and 32-47, drawn to a method to prevent or reduce haze in a beverage using a proline or hydroxyl-proline specific endoprotease, for examination on the merits is acknowledged. Applicant's election of the species :

Group (1) the auxillary enzyme is an endoprotease,

Group (2) the exopeptidase is a tripeptidylpeptidase,

Group (3) the endoprotease is an aspartic acid protease, and

Group (4) the beverage is beer,

is acknowledged. Applicants submit that 17-22, 25-31 and 34-47 read on the elected species of (1). Claims 17, 19-20, 23-33 and 35-47 read on the elected species of (2). Claims 17-22, 25-31 and 34-47 read on the elected species of (3). Claims 17-28, 31-37 and 39-47 read on the elected species of (4). Applicants note that the claims

other than claim 18 do not require addition of an endoprotease to the exclusion of an exoprotease.

Applicants argue the restriction requirement on the basis that special technical feature is "adding a proline-specific endoprotease and :adding an auxillary enzyme" to the beverage. As was stated previously and below, Edens et al. (US 2004/0241791 A1 as well as other listed references teach this "special technical feature" and thus it is not special and thus unity of invention is lacking.

Claims 23, 24, 27, 29-33, 38, 41, 44, 47 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper."

No information disclosure statement has been found in the application at this time.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded

hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. (See specifically page 17, line 25).

Appropriate correction is required.

The use of the trademark Fromase ® has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 17-19 , 25, 26, 28, 34, 35-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagodawithana and Reed (eds.), Enzymes in

Food Processing, 3rd Edition, Academic Press, Inc. San Diego, Chapter 16, pp 448-449, 1993, See IDS).

Nagodawithana and Reed teach a method to prevent or reduce haze in a beverage, which method comprises adding a proline-specific endoprotease, as defined by applicants specification at page 3, lines 15-22, to include any endoprotease that cuts proteins or peptides near or at places where the protein or peptide contains a prolyl-residue in its chain, to the beverage, in this case beer. Nagodawithana and Reed teach methods of reducing haze in a beverage comprising the addition of bromelin, papain and pepsin to a beverage.

Thus claims 1-9, 13, 14, 16, 31, 32, 40, 42 and 44 are anticipated by Nagodawithana and Reed.

Claims 17, 19, 25, 28, 34, 39, 42 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shetty et al. (U.S. 4,532,213, published 7/30/1985)

Shetty et al. teach methods of recovery of acid fungal proteases for their use in food, brewing and photographic industries, which comprise which comprises adding the fungus, *Aspergillus niger*, comprising a proline-specific endoprotease and an auxiliary enzyme to an aqueous medium (beverage) wherein the addition of said auxiliary enzyme results in further prevention or reduction of haze than is achievable with the proline-specific endoprotease alone. Applicant's specification at page 3, lines 9-13 are recognized in the recitation:

"In the framework of this invention the term "beverage" includes beverages in all stages of their preparation. Thus, a beverage is not only a beverage ready for consumption but also any composition used to prepare the beverage. For example, wort as used in beer preparation is encompassed by the term "beverage" as used herein. Also, the addition of a prolyl-specific endoprotease during the preparation of a beverage to compositions that are not or not entirely liquid is intended to fall within the method according to the invention. A prolyl-specific endoprotease added to a mash at the start of beer brewing is an example of such a composition. "

While it is admitted that Shetty et al. do not add the two different enzymes separately after their isolation or purification, Shetty et al. do add the two enzymes inherently by the addition of the culture of *Aspergillus niger* to the medium.

Thus claims 17, 19, 25, 28, 34, 39, 42 and 45 are anticipated by Shetty et al.

Claims 17-20, 25, 26, 28, 34-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 102(e) as being anticipated by Edens et al. (US 2004/0241791 A1, published 12/2/2004)

Edens et al. teach a method of enzymatically producing a protein hydrolysate intended for flavoring and nutrient enhancement of sport drinks and juice-based beverages and beer and beer mashes, comprising incubating a praline-specific endoprotease and another endoprotease with a protein substrate intended for a beverage. Edens et al. further teach said methods wherein said proline-specific carboxypeptidase is obtainable from *Xanthomonas*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Nagodawithana and Reed (eds.), Enzymes in Food Processing, 3rd Edition, Academic Press, Inc. San Diego, Chapter 16, pp 448-449, 1993) as applied to claims 17-19 , 25, 26, 28, 34, 35-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46 above, and further in view of Edens et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,372,282 B1 published 4/16/2002).

As discussed above, Nagodawithana and Reed teach a method to prevent or reduce haze in a beverage, which method comprises adding a proline-specific endoprotease, as defined by applicants specification at page 3, lines 15-22, to include any endoprotease that cuts proteins or peptides near or at places where the protein or peptide contains a prolyl-residue in its chain, to the beverage, in this case beer. Nagodawithana and Reed teach methods of reducing haze in a beverage comprising the addition of bromelin, papain and pepsin to a beverage. Nagodawithana and Reed do not teach the addition of an aspartic acid protease such as FROMASE® to the taught methods of reducing haze in a beverage.

Edens et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,372,282 B1 published 4/16/2002) teach methods of obtaining enzymatically hydrolyzed proteinaceous material for human consumption

comprising the use of an exopeptidase in combination with one or more endopeptidases such as the aspartic acid protease, Fromase®.

One of skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the methods taught by Nagodawithana and Reed with those taught by Edens et al. resulting in methods of hydrolyzing proteinaceous material for human consumption, comprising the combination of multiple proteases or peptidases including bromelin, papain, pepsin and fromase® to a beverage to hydrolyze proteinaceous material. The expectation of success is high due to the teachings of both Nagodawithana and Reed and Edens et al. who both teach methods of hydrolysis of proteinaceous material comprising the use of multiple proteases or peptidases. Such methods would have further resulted in predictable results given the knowledge in the field of protein hydrolysis for human consumption.

Finish here.

Thus claims 1-9, 13, 14, 16, 31, 32, 40, 42 and 44 are anticipated by Nagodawithana and Reed.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140

F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 17, 18, 25, 26, 28, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16, 31, 43, 45-61 of copending Application No. 10/450,022. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-16, 31, 43, 45-61 of copending Application No. 10/450,022 are drawn to a method to reduce haze in a beverage comprising adding a proline-specific endoprotease comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 5 to the beverage. Additionally copending Application No. 10/450,022 teaches that additional methods of the reduction of chill haze formation in beer is the addition of papain to the beer. Thus copending Application No. 10/450,022 teaches that it would be obvious to add an auxiliary enzyme such as papain as taught by 10/450,022 to the beverage in addition to a proline-specific endoprotease to reduce the haze in the beverage.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 17-20, 25, 26,28, 34-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14-17 of copending Application No. 10/433,747. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 14-17 of copending Application No. 10/433,747 are drawn to a method of enzymatically producing an protein hydrolysate from a protein substrate comprising adding a proline-specific endoprotease and one or more other endoproteases to a protein substrate, thus anticipating claims 17-20, 25, 26,28, 34-37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46 to a method of reducing haze in a beverage comprising adding a praline-specific endoprotease and an auxiliary endoprotease to a beverage.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Remarks

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard G. Hutson whose telephone number is 571-272-0930. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nashaat T. Nashed can be reached on 571-272-0934. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

rgh
3/25/2009

/Richard G Hutson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652